up the efficiency, and they must also see to the claims of the men in service. The recruitment must be left to their discretion. A hard and fast rule is not suitable, and Government cannot accept the principle.

SUBJECT No. 31.

Time-limit for the disposal of Civil and Criminal cases.

Messrs. K. T. Devappa, Tirthahalli Taluk, and Shanbhog Sankarappa, Holalkere Taluk.

Mr. K. T. Devappa.—It is necessary that there should be a maximum limit of time within which both in the Civil and Criminal courts, cases should be disposed of. As per existing practice, some cases drag on for a number of years and it will be very inconvenient and troublesome to the parties to attend the court many a time, and spend unnecessarily large amounts. The new special courts are located in distant places—sometimes more than 50 miles away. Witnesses simply decline to go. If a maximum time is fixed, there will be no room for such difficulty to the parties.

Mr. Sankarappa.—Some of the criminal cases will be allowed to drag on for a long period. By lapse of time, the parties and witnesses may entirely forget material facts connected with the case, and as such, there is likely to be injustice. A time-limit will avoid this trouble.

Mr. Justice K. S. Chandrasekhara Aiyar.—The delay in the disposal of the cases is mainly due to the parties and witnesses on some of whom summons cannot be served in time. At times, the party himself prays for adjournments and if he satisfies the court that he cannot attend the court on the day fixed, the court has to comply with his request. The delay is unavoidable, and is comparatively slight so far as the court is concerned. A limit will mean hasty disposals, and, then applications to set aside the order. Even the Chief Court is approached. All efforts are made to dispose of cases speedily.

Mr. K. T. Devappa.—I admit. But without a limit there is cause for delay.

Mr. Justice K. S. Chandrasekhara Aiyar.—Adjournments are given for sufficient reasons.

Messrs. K. T. Devappa and D. S. Mallappa.—People get ruined by the delay. The value of the evidence is lost.

Mr. Justice K. S. Chandrasekhara Aiyar.—It is known. What is the remedy ?

Dewan.—We will consult the Chief Court to suggest measures to prevent delay. We will do what is possible.

SUBJECT No. 32.

Abolition of the Bench Courts. The Amildars and Sub-Division Officers to exercise Magisterial functions as formerly.

Messrs. Chikmallappa, Gundlupet Taluk, Kullegowda, Nagamangala Taluk; Puttasamigowda, Malvalli Taluk, and Chikmayigowda, Bannur Municipality.

Mr. Kullegowda.—The Bench Magistrates' Courts in the taluk headquarters may be abolished, as sufficient powers are not given to these Magistrates, and people are not saved the worry of going to other courts in distant places. This work can easily be entrusted to Amildars.

Mr. Chikmayigowda.—We cannot expect justice in the Bench Magistrates' Courts, as the Magistrates are not generally qualified men and as they do not know much of Law. The Amildars may be invested with the powers they originally exercised.

Mr. C. Narayana Setti.—There will be no abuse of Law in the Bench Magistrates' Court, as they exercise powers only under a few sections. These courts decide mostly questions of common sense and are very useful to the public. People will in many cases be saved the trouble of going to other courts as efforts are made to effect compromises in all possible ways.

Mr. Justice K. S. Chandrasekhara Aiyar.—Recently, the powers of the Bench Magistrates have been enhanced and only simple cases will be tried by these courts. So far as the Chief Court is aware, the Magistrates are doing their work properly. It is only in very few cases that judgments are inaccurate. If the matter is brought to the notice of the Chief Court, there will be a remedy. Retired officers are often on the Bench.

Mr. Kullegowda.—Then we have no grievance.

Second Member of Council.—The powers of these courts have been enhanced. As three Magistrates will have to decide the case, people can expect justice. These courts are really very useful to the public.

SUBJECT No. 33.

Batta for assessors in criminal cases.

Mr. Kanchugar Kalappa, Chitaldrug Municipality.

Mr. Kalappa.—If Government servants are summoned as witnesses in Sessions cases, they get batta. Similarly the assessors also may be given batta for attending the courts, as they do so even at the sacrifice of their personal work.

If the assessors do not attend the court in time, they are liable to punishment. This is hard on them. In certain cases they have to attend the court for a number of days and this will cause them much inconvenience.

Mr. Justice K. S. Chandrasekhara Aiyar.—Assessors belong to the place.

Mr. Kalappa.—Cases drag on from eight to ten days and there is loss of income.

Mr. Justice K. S. Chandrasekhara Aiyar.—No batta is paid to assessors in British India. Cases last for two or three days only, eight days is very exceptional. The service is honorary and payment is not desirable. If a man has served as assessor for a long period, the court will, on his representation, select some other man in his place and give him rest.

Mr. Kalappa.—It is not done. I have had to serve twice or thrice a year.

Mr. Justice K. S. Chandrasekhara Aiyar.-The Judge, if asked, will exempt you.

Dewan.—I do not think this is a good proposition.

SUBJECT No. 34.

Batta to witnesses attending Criminal Courts.

Mr. G B. Madhvachar, Koratagere Sub-Taluk.

Mr. G. B. Madhvachar.—*Batta* is paid to witnesses attending civil courts. It is necessary to show this concession to the witnesses attending the criminal courts also.

Mr. Justice K. S. Chandrasekhara Aiyar and Dewan.—This is under the consideration of Government.

SUBJECT No. 35.

Batta to be paid to witnesses in private criminal cases.

Mr. B. V. Rangaiya, French Rocks Sub-Taluk.

Summary of Representation.—*Batta* may be arranged to be paid to witnesses who are not Government servants in private criminal cases.

Dewan.—The question of paying *batta* to witnesses in private criminal cases is under the consideration of Government.

SUBJECT No. 36.

Suits against officers for Civil damages.

Mr. T. G. Nagappa, Tuvekere Sub-Taluk.

Mr. T. G. Nagappa.—As per existing rules, raiyats are not allowed to sue officers who pass wilful orders and consequently cause them great loss and inconvenience. If people are allowed to bring suits against Government officers, for damages, it will facilitate matters.

Mr. Justice K. S. Chandrasekhara Aiyar.—What rules do you refer to?